

APR 22 2004

Unofficial

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(s): Lundell et al.

SERIAL NO.: 09/419,171

ART UNIT: 2685

FILING DATE: October 15, 1999

EXAMINER: Gesesse, T.

TITLE: CELL RE-SELECTION UTILIZING SYSTEM
INFORMATION LENGTH (As amended)

ATTORNEY

DOCKET NO.: 324-008940-US (PAR)

TO: Examiner Gesesse

Fax: 703-872-9306

AGENDA FOR INTERVIEW

Dear Examiner Gesesse:

I would like to discuss the following during our telephone interview at 3:00 PM on April 23, 2004. These points are from paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated 26 February 2004.

1. From the Office Action: "Korpela discloses a subscriber terminal measuring received power of neighbor cells in accordance with system information received from a current cell (column 8, lines 16-21)."

I find that column 8, lines 16-21 discloses that the mobile station measures the power of the present base station. I don't see where it discloses measuring received power of neighbor cells.

2. From the Office Action: "Korpela discloses receiving the system information of the new cell by employing the length

information in the system information part sent by the new cell (column 4, line 65-column 5 line 10)."

I don't find any reference to employing the length information in this section of Korpela. This section only describes the system information exists. There is nothing about receiving a part of the system information sent by the cell, and nothing about employing length information to calculate the time for receiving information sent by the new cell.

3. From the Office Action: "Korpela discloses calculating the received signal from neighboring cell system information length and capacity (column 7, lines 52-59)."

This section discloses that the mobile station may calculate where in the message certain information is situated, using the contents of the fields 33. There is nothing related to employing length information to calculate the time for receiving information sent by the new cell.

4. From the Office Action: "Korpela discloses transfer to new cell based on the mobile based on time measurement to reselect the cell and utilizing the time in the cell reselection (column 9, lines 17-45)."

First, the claims call for cell re-selection by using the time it takes to receive the system information. The claims do not recite transferring to a new cell based on the time to reselect the cell.

Second, column 9, lines 17-45 discloses that the system information message may be shortened, that is, the message may only contain system information about cells that have a certain quality of service. If a suitable cell can't be found, a more

extensive list of cells is sent. There is nothing related to calculating the time for receiving information sent by the new cell by employing length information.

5. From the Office Action: "Korpela does not explicitly teach calculating the time used for receiving system information. Korpela discloses a system information message that includes network control information with verity of lengthy of neighboring cells (table 2 column 7, lines 5-23) and also neighboring cells transmit system information from quiet a distance are lower quality (column 8, lines 37-59 and figure 4). This indicates that cell information transmits from distance takes longer time to process, this technique utilizes for reselecting process."

Table 2, column 7, lines 5-23, simply demonstrates that length of field 33 in the system information message may vary. That is, the length of the system information may vary based on how the cells and their classes are represented. This has nothing to do with using the length information to calculate the time to receive the information.

Column 8, lines 37-59 states that the mobile station receives information sent by the present base station (lines 31-33) which includes the quality of service of neighboring cells. There is nothing related to the distance of the cells, and nothing about using the length of the cell information to calculate the time to receive the system information.

I don't understand how table 2 in column 7, lines 5-23, and Figure 4 and column 8, lines 37-59 relate to the present claims. More explanation would be appreciated.

I would appreciate it if you could address these points during our discussion.

I will call at 3:00 PM.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph V. Gamberdell, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,695

22 April 2004
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512